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1. Introduction
1.1 Potential constructions in Japanese

- **e/rare ‘can’ = POT₁**

(1) Hanako-wa Taro-o taos-e-ru
H-TOP T-ACC beat-POT₁-NPST

‘Hanako can beat Taro.’

- **u/e ‘can’ = POT₂**

(2) Hanako-wa Taro-o taosi-u-ru
H-TOP T-ACC beat-POT₂-NPST

‘Hanako can beat Taro.’

---

Claim #1: POT₁ (e/rare) is a morphological realization of Voice (Krazter 1994, 1996) and root modal bundled together (while POT₂ is a higher modal)

- motivated by their differences in (1) modal force, (2) Case, (3) subject selection and (4) compatibility with passive

1.2 POT₁ and CAUSE

- **POT₁** and the lexical causatives (3a) and the productive causative *sase* (3b)

(3) a. Hanako-wa tetuboo-o mag-e-rare-ru
H-TOP steel bar-ACC bend-CAUSE-POT₁-NPST

‘Hanako can bend a steel bar.’

b. Taro-wa Hanako-o waraw-ase-rare-ru
T-TOP H-ACC laugh-CAUSE-POT₁-NPST

‘Taro can make Hanako laugh.’ (productive causative)

---

Claim #2: Their distribution and interaction suggest that POT₁ (e/rare) and CAUSE belong to two different categories.

- we assume the causatives are instances of little v (Miyagawa 1994, 1998; Harley 1995, 2008)

- differences between POT₁ and CAUSE support the claim that there are two distinct modal projections above VP: Voice and v (Pylkkänen 2002, 2008; Cuervo 2003; Alexiadou et al. 2006; Legate 2010, 2012; Harley 2013)

2. POT₁ e/rare vs. POT₂ u/e
2.1 POT₁: e/rare ‘can’

(4) a. Taro-wa ringo-dake-o tabe-rare-ru
T-TOP apple-only-ACC eat-POT₁-NPST

‘Taro can eat only apples.’

b. Taro-ni-wa ringo-dake-ga tabe-rare-ru
T-NI-TOP apple-only-NOM eat-POT₁-NPST

‘Taro can eat only apples.’

c. Taro-ga ringo-dake-ga tabe-rare-ru
T-NOM apple-only- NOM eat-POT₁-NPST

‘Taro can eat only apples.’

- **non-canonical case patterns** (Kuroda 1965, 1978; Kuno 1973; Inoue 1978; Saito 1982; Sugioka 1984; Takezawa 1987 etc.)

- **object scope**: Nominal objects tend to take scope over POT₁ while accusative objects tend to scope under POT₁ (Sano 1985; Tada 1992; Koizumi 1993, 1995; Saito and Hoshi 1998; Takano 2003; Nomura 2005a, 2005b; Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2007 etc.).

2.2 POT₂: u/e ‘can’

(2) Hanako-wa Taro-o taosi-u-ru
H-TOP T-ACC beat-POT₂-NPST

‘Hanako can beat Taro.’

- considered ‘literary’ (Martin 1975: 303); received little attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POT₁ (e/rare) and POT₂ (u/e) are systematically different in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. modal force expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. case of DPs involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. subject selection, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. compatibility with passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- set aside object scope (See Takano 2003, Nomura 2005a, 2005b; Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2007 for recent proposals)
3 Four differences between POT₁ (e/rare) and POT₂ (u/e)

3.1 Modal force

(1) = Hanako is able to beat Taro. (root)
(2) = It is possible that Hanako will beat Taro (non-root)

2.3.2 Subject Selection (Inoue 1976; Teramura 1982; Aoki 1997)

- Both POT are compatible with agents (1) & (2) and causers (5).

(5) a. Kono bakudan-wa machi-o hitotu hukitobas-e-ru
   this bomb-TOP this-town ACC one-CL blow-away POT-ACC-NPST
   ‘This bomb can blow away an entire town.’

b. Kono bakudan-wa machi-o hitotu hukitobasi-u-ru
   this bomb-TOP this-town ACC one-CL blow-away POT-ACC-NPST
   ‘This bomb can blow away an entire town.’

- POT₁ incompatible with non-agent animate subjects.

(6) a. #John(-ni)-wa zisin-ga usinaw-e-na-katta
   J(-NI)-TOP confidence-NOM lose-VN-NPST
   (*John could not lose his confidence.*)

b. (make-tzu-ke-reba) John-wa zisin-o usinai-u-ru
   (lose-keep-cond) J-TOP confidence-ACC lose-VN-NPST
   (*If he continues to lose, John can lose his confidence.*)

- POT₁ incompatible with non-causer inanimate subjects.

(7) a. #Kane-wa sugu-ni atumari-e-ru
   money-TOP immediately gather-VN-NPST
   (*Money can be gathered right away.*)

b. Kane-wa sugu-ni atumari-u-ru
   money-TOP immediately gather-VN-NPST
   ‘Money can be gathered right away.’

3.3 Case

- POT₁ allows for ‘dative’ subjects (DP-ni) & nominative objects (DP-ga).
  - Nominative objects are obligatory with dative subjects.

(8) Taro-ni-wa Hanako-ga/*o taos-e-ru
    T-NI(-TOP) H-NOM/*ACC beat-VN-NPST
    ‘Taro is able to beat Hanako.’

- POT₂ allows for neither.

(9) a. *Taro-ni(-wa) Hanako-o taosi-u-ru
    T-NI(-TOP) H-ACC beat-VN-NPST
    (*It is possible that Taro will beat Hanako.*)

b. *Taro(-ni)-wa Hanako-ga taosi-u-ru
   T(-NI)-TOP H-NOM beat-VN-NPST
   (*It is possible that Taro will beat Hanako.*)

3.4 Passive

- POT₁ does not co-occur with passive (Inoue 1976).

(10) a. *Taro-wa gityoo-ni erab-are-rare-ru
    T-TOP chairperson-COP choose-PASS-VN-NPST
    (*Taro is able to be chosen as a chairperson.)

b. *Taro-wa gityoo-ni erab-e-rare-ru
    T-TOP chairperson-COP choose-VN-NPST
    (*Taro is able to be chosen as a chairperson.)

- POT₂ can follow passive but cannot be followed by it.

(11) a. Taro-wa gityoo-ni erab-are-u-ru
    T-TOP chairperson-COP choose-VN-NPST
    ‘It is possible that Taro will be chosen as a chairperson.’

b. *Taro-wa gityoo-ni erabi-u-rare-ru
    T-TOP chairperson-COP choose-PASS-VN-NPST
    (*It is possible that Taro will be chosen as a chairperson.*)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>case</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POT₁</td>
<td>root</td>
<td>agent or causer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT₁</td>
<td>non-root</td>
<td>no restriction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Proposal

- POT₁ (e/rare) is a morphological realization of Voice and root modal bundled together
  - Voice introduces an external argument and licenses (certain) case (Krazter 1994, 1996)

- POT₂ (u/e) is a higher (alethic) modal (Cinque 1999; Condrovdi 2002; Stowell 2004)

\[
\text{Modal}_{\text{ALETHIC}} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{Modal}_{\text{ROOT}} \quad \text{Modal}_{\text{ALETHIC}} \\
\text{VoiceP} \quad \text{Modal}_{\text{ROOT}} \\
\text{Voice} \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{e/rare} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{Voice}
\]
POT₁ comes in three different flavors

- **accusative**
  - ModalROOTP
  - VoiceP
  - ModalROOT
  - DP
  - Voice’
  - vP
  - Voice’
  - POT₁
  - VP
  - v

- **caseless**
  - ModalALETHICP
  - VoiceP
  - ModalROOT
  - DP
  - Voice’
  - vP
  - Voice’
  - POT₁
  - VP
  - v

- **ergative (Kuroda 1978)**
  - ModalROOTP
  - Voice
  - ModalROOT
  - DP
  - Voice’
  - vP
  - Voice’
  - POT₁
  - VP
  - v

4.1 Difference #4: Passive
- POT₁ does not co-occur with passive because both Passive & POT₁ are Voice.

- POT₁: ModalROOTP
  - VoiceP
  - ModalROOT
  - DP
  - Voice’
  - vP
  - Voice’
  - POT₁
  - VP
  - v

- POT₂: ModalALETHICP
  - VoiceP
  - ModalROOT
  - Voice’
  - vP
  - Voice’
  - POT₂
  - VP
  - v

4.2 Difference #3: Case
- POT₁ allows for ‘dative’ subjects and nominative objects because of the ‘ergative’ (and caseless) POT₁.

- POT₁ allows for ‘dative’ subjects and nominative objects because of the ‘ergative’ (and caseless) POT₁.

- POT₂ is structurally too high to affect case

- POT₁ requires agent/causer but POT₂ imposes no restrictions
  - because POT₁ is Voice = it introduces an external argument.

4.3 Difference #2: Subject selection
- POT₁ requires agent/causer but POT₂ imposes no restrictions
  - because POT₁ is Voice = it introduces an external argument.

An external argument can only be agent, causer or certain experiencers
• again \( \text{POT}_2 \) is too high to interact with thematic roles.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Modal}_{\text{ALETHIC}} \text{P} \\
\text{Modal}_{\text{ROOT}} \text{P} \text{Modal}_{\text{ALETHIC}} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{Modal}_{\text{ROOT}} \\
\text{Voice}' \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

the structure below VoiceP determines the thematic role of subjects

4.4 Difference #1: Modal force

• \( \text{POT}_1 = \text{root}; \text{POT}_2 = \text{non-root} \)
  • root vs. non-root distinction correlates with syntactic positions of modals (Picallo 1990; Cinque 1999; Butler 2004; Stowell 2004; Hacquard 2010)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Cinque 1999} \\
\text{Modal}_{\text{EPISTEMIC}} > \text{Tense} > \text{Modal}_{\text{ALETHIC}} > \text{Modal}_{\text{ROOT}} > \text{Voice} \\
\end{array}
\]

Our proposal:

(12) a. Lexical causative (= 3a) 
   b. Productive causative (=3b)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{Modal}_{\text{ROOT}} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{Voice'} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Hanako-NOM} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{rare} \\
\text{POT}_1 \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{Voice'} \\
\text{rare} \\
\text{POT}_1 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{steal\text{-ACC}} \\
\text{V \text{CAUSE}} \\
\text{mag} \\
\text{bend} \\
\text{Hanako-ACC} \\
\text{Voice \text{CAUSE}} \\
\text{waraw} \\
\text{laugh} \\
\end{array}
\]

An alternative: a \text{vP recursion} analysis

• \( \text{POT}_1 \) has been analyzed as heading a \text{vPs} as well (Nomura 2005b; Bobaljick & Wurmbrand 2007).
  • Under such an analysis, \( \text{POT}_1 \) and \text{CAUSE} (and probably \text{PASS}) belong to the same category (i.e \text{v}) and they can recursively project \text{vPs}.

(13)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{POT}_1 \left( \Theta_{\text{EXT}} \right) \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{CAUSE} \left( \Theta_{\text{EXT}}_{\text{acc}} \right) \\
\end{array}
\]

5. \( \text{POT}_1 \) (\text{e/rare}) and the causatives (\text{CAUSE})

• The causatives head \text{vPs} (Miyagawa 1994, 1998; Harley 1995, 2008)
  • Lexical causatives select for a \text{vP} complement
  • The productive causative can take either a \text{vP} or \text{VoiceP/vP} complement.
5.1 Evidence for our proposal

5.1.1 CAUSE cannot embed POT

(13) *Taro-wa Hanako-o waraw-e-sase-ta
    T-TOP H-ACC laugh-POT-cause-npst
    (‘Taro made Hanako to be able to laugh.’)

[VP recursion analysis] requires an additional assumption to rule out (13).

Our proposal (13) is ungrammatical because CAUSE takes either a VP or
VoiceP as complement but POT heads ModalROOTP.

5.1.2 Case of embedded subject under CAUSE & POT

- An embedded subject under CAUSE (‘direct’ causative ≈ ECM) must bear
  nominative case with POT and an ergative matrix subject:

(14) a. Taro-ga hana-o/#ga kireini sak-ase-ta
    T-NOM flower-acc/#nom beautifully bloom-cause-npst
    ‘Taro had the flowers bloom beautifully.’

b. Taro-ni-wa hana-ga/#o kireini sak-ase-rare-ta
    T-NI-TOP flower-NOM/#ACC beautifully bloom-caus-POT-PST
    ‘Taro had the flowers bloom beautifully.’

(15) a. Hanako-wa Taro-o/#ga waraw-ase-ta
    H-NI-TOP T-only-ACC/#DAT/#NOM laugh-caus-PST
    ‘Hanako can make Taro laugh.’

b. Hanako-ni-wa [Taro-ga/#o] waraw-ase-rare-ru
    H-NI-TOP T-NOM/#ACC laugh-caus-POT-PST
    ‘Taro can make children eat only vegetables.’

[VP recursion analysis] fails to account for nominative case on the embedded
subject (16a).

[Our proposal] nominative case on the embedded subject is the only choice under
the ergative POT (16b).

(16) a. vP
    DP-ERG v’
    v’
    v POT (\Theta_{EXT} erg)
    XP cause (\Theta_{EXT} acc)
    DP-ACC

b. vP
    VoiceP ModalROOT
    v’
    v POT (\Theta_{EXT} erg)
    XP cause (\Theta_{EXT} acc)
    DP-NOM

5.1.3 Additional arguments

- Restructuring analysis of nominative objects: Nominative objects result when
  POT takes a VP without an embedded v (Nomura 2005b; Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2007)

(17) a. vP
    VP POT
    v’
    v
    [\emptyset]
    DP
    V
    [\emptyset]
    VP-complement = nominative

- However, it is not clear how cases like (15b) could be accounted by the
  restructuring analysis.

(18) a. Hanako-wa [Taro-ni susi-o] table-saze]-ta-i
    H-TOP [T-DAT susi-NOM] eat-CAUSE-want-PST
    ‘Hanako wants to make/let Taro eat sushi.’

b. Taro-wa [ec Hanako-ni t home-rare]-ta-i
    T-TOP [ec H-BY t praise-PASS]-want-PST
    ‘Taro wants to be praised by Hanako.’

c. *Hanako-wa [ec eigo-ga] hanas-e]-ta-i
    H-TOP [ec English-NOM] speak-POT-want-PST
    (‘Hanako wants be able to speak English.’)

(19) a. Hanako-wa [Taro-ni susi-o] table-saze]-tuzuke-ta
    H-TOP [T-DAT susi-ACC] eat-CAUSE-continue-PST
    ‘Hanako continued to make/let Taro eat sushi.’
b. Taro-wa [ec Hanako-ni t musis-are]-tsuzuke-ta
   T-TOP [ec H-BY t ignore-PASS]-continue-PST
   (‘Taro continued to be ignored by Hanako.’)

c. *Hanako-wa [ec eigo-o hanas-e]-tsuzuke-ta
   H-TOP [ec English-ACC speak-POT]-continue-PST
   (‘Hanako continued to be able to speak English.’)

⇒ only POT₁ is incompatible with these items.

**Our proposal**: POT₁ heads a ModalᵣROOT while others are VoicePs

6 Conclusions

- POT₁ (e/rare) is Voice + ModalᵣROOT. It introduces an external argument and is responsible for distribution of certain case markers.
- CAUSE is v: it introduces causation (Pylkkäänen 2002; Alexiadou et al. 2006).
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